

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending in the application. No claim has been amended. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the remarks contained herein.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-7, 9-14, and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morita et al. in US 2003/0218720 (hereinafter Morita) in view of Kienzle, III et al. in US 6,285,902 (hereinafter Kienzle) and Tomasi et al. in US 2002/0021287 (hereinafter Tomasi). Claims 8 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morita in view of Kienzle and Tomasi, in further view of Sauer et al. in US 6,307,674 (hereinafter Sauer).

First, claims 1 and 3 recite a sterilizable screen and “a sterilizable protective housing **connected mechanically to the sterilizable screen.**”

In the “Response to Arguments,” the Examiner alleges that Morita in combination with Kienzle teaches this limitation. The Examiner alleges that Morita teaches a sterilizable screen and Kienzle teaches the sterile drape 196 mechanically attached to the C-arm 112 assembled **with an imager 152** (FIG. 10). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Kienzle discloses an imager 151 mounted in a housing 152 (FIGS. 4-5 and col. 10, lines 28-31). The imager 151 comprises a highly regular **array of semiconductor sensing elements that produce an electric signal** in response to incident x-ray energy (FIGS. 4-5 and col. 10, lines 33-36). The imager 151 is an imaging device based on a flat and highly regular array of sensors to collect raw data signals (FIGS. 4-5

and col. 10, lines 36-40). The imager 151 is not a display device or screen. Therefore, Kienzle and Morita in combination do not teach or suggest a sterilizable protective housing **connected mechanically to the sterilizable screen**. Claims 1 and 3 are allowable for at least this reason.

Further, claims 1 and 3 recite “a sterilizable protective housing connected mechanically to the screen, the protective housing being free of electronic components and operable for **receiving, in a reversible manner, the detection device**.”

The Examiner admits that Morita in view of Kienzle fail to teach the protective housing receiving the detection device in the instant Office Action (Page 4). The Examiner then alleges that Tomasi teaches an input device that projects **the display** and detects input at the displayed surface and the display projector and sensor are both part of **the display**. The Examiner further alleges that 140 is the display, that the optical system “20 is the emitter projecting the virtual input device 50,” and that the second optical system 60 is the detector. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Tomasi discloses a sensing system 10 comprising a first optical system 20 and a second optical system 60. The first optical system 20 emits a fan beam plane 30 to project virtual input device 50 onto the work surface 40 (FIG. 1A and col. 5, lines 31-60). The second optical system 20 detects the interactions of objects 120, 120L, and 120 R and the beam plane 30 (FIG. 1A and col. 6, lines 50-56). The interactions are then reflected on a display 140 (FIG. 1A and col. 6, lines 33-35). However, the virtual input device 50 is displayed on work surface 40 that is **separated** from the display 140. Tomasi teaches a first optical system 20 and a second optical system 60 are both part of a display 140. But the display 140 is not projected by the projector system 20.

Moreover, like the position detection camera 145 detects the marker 146 on the image projection panel 141 in Morita, the second optical system 60 detects object 120 on the virtual input devices 50. However, the second optical system 60 and the virtual input devices 50 are not in a single device. The combination of Morita and Tomasi would not create a control device including a sterilizable screen, a projection device, and a detection device. Therefore, Morita in view of Kienzle and Tomasi do not teach or suggest a sterilizable protective housing **connected mechanically to the sterilizable screen**. Claims 1 and 3 are allowable for at least this reason.

Dependent claims 2 and 4-18 depend from allowable claims 1 and 3, so are allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 1 and 3.

CONCLUSION

Based on the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney to expedite allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

/Hao Tan, PhD./
Agent No. L586
Agent for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200